

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 27-50 are pending in this application. Claims 27-50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 38-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claims 27-50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. patent 6,606,657 to Zilberstein et al. (herein “Zilberstein”).

Addressing the rejection of claims 27-50 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

The claims were rejected as the previous language “having an audience number which is sufficient for a statistical analysis processing” was unclear. In response the claims now more clearly recite that “a number of audiences of the related page assembly is sufficiently large so as to obtain an audience characteristic regarding the related page assembly by a statistical analysis processing”. Applicants respectfully submit that such subject matter is clear to one of ordinary skill in the art and that the clarified claim language addresses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Addressing now the rejection of claims 38-48 under 35 U.S.C. §101, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

Claims 38-48 are amended by the present response to be directed to a “computer readable recording medium including computer readable program code”. Thus, the claims are now more clearly directed to statutory subject matter as the claims are directed to a tangible recording medium. Applicants also note claims 38-48 clearly produce a concrete, useful, and tangible result; the result of the claimed invention is an output statistical analysis. Thus, claims 38-48 are believed to clearly set forth statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Addressing now the rejection of claims 27-50 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Zilberstein, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

Independent claim 27 is directed to a Web audience analyzing method. The applicants of the present invention recognized that when a number of audiences accessing a target Web page assembly is small, it is difficult to gain accurate results for audience analysis by statistically analyzing the small audience characteristics. To address that problem claim 27 sets forth a Web audience analyzing method with the following operations (1) – (3). (1) A *related page assembly* that is related to a target Web page assembly is acquired. (2) The number of audiences of the *related page assembly* is sufficiently large so as to obtain an audience characteristic regarding the *related page assembly* by a statistical analysis processing. (3) A statistical analysis result of the related page assembly is output as an estimated value of the audience characteristics *regarding the target Web page assembly*. The target Web page assembly and the related page assembly will include common features. With the number of audiences who access the related page assembly being sufficiently large so as to proceed with the statistical analysis, in the claimed invention the statistical analysis result of the related page assembly is output as the estimated value of the audience characteristics regarding the target page assembly.

The other independent claims recite similar features as in independent claim 27 discussed above.

With the claimed invention, it becomes possible to output the estimated value of characteristics regarding the audience accessing the target Web page assembly even if a number of audiences accessing the target Web page assembly is small. By virtue of the statistical analysis on the related page assembly, the estimated value of the audience characteristics regarding the target Web page assembly can be used by analysts.

The claims as written are believed to clearly distinguish over Zilberstein.

Zilberstein discloses a system that can count a number of users who visit a particular set of Web pages. As an example of the information that can be determined by the system in Zilberstein, Zilberstein states, “For example, a site operator may be interested in determining the number of 20-30 year old female user who visited a particular set of web pages within a web site over the last month during business hours”.¹ Thus, in the system of Zilberstein what is actually counted is the number of users who visited a particular set of Web pages. Such a particular set of Web pages in Zilberstein would clearly correspond to the claimed “target Web page assembly”.

Zilberstein does not, however, disclose or suggest anything similar to the claimed “related page assembly”.

In the claimed invention, a statistical analysis is actually performed on a number of audiences of a *related page assembly* and *not of a target page assembly*. Zilberstein does not disclose anything even similar as Zilberstein does not disclose or suggest utilizing a related page assembly, which is related to but different from a target Web page assembly, and performing statistical analysis on a number of audiences of the related page assembly.

In the claimed invention it becomes possible to output an analysis result of a related page assembly as an estimated value of characteristics regarding an audience accessing a target page assembly, which can be valuable when the number of audiences accessing a target Web page assembly is small. Zilberstein does not disclose or suggest anything closely related.

With respect to the claimed feature of acquiring related information including a designation of a related page assembly related to a target Web page assembly, the outstanding Office Action cites Zilberstein at column 5, lines 1-16 and column 5, lines 61-64.² In response to that basis for the rejection, applicants note that disclosure in Zilberstein is not

¹ Zilberstein at column 5, lines 61-64.

² Office Action of July 27, 2002, page 3, prenumbered paragraph 7.

believed to set forth anything even close to the claimed “related page assembly”. At column 5, lines 1-16 Zilberstein merely discloses usage information, which is directed to what would correspond to the target Web page assembly in the claimed features. Further, at column 5, lines 61-64 Zilberstein again merely notes determining a number of visitors of an actual target Web page assembly.

As discussed above, the claims are not directed to such a system of determining a number of audiences of a target Web page assembly, but instead of a related page assembly.

In such ways, the claims as currently written are believed to clearly distinguish over Zilberstein.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
SNS/rac

I:\ATTY\SNS\21's\212055\212055US-AF.DOC